1-9 SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH BILASPUR

WP (Cr.) No. 7553 / 2006

Petitioner/ Non-Applicant	Satish Kumar 28 Yr. S/o Lochanram Dindore, Vill. G-Cabin, H.No.504, Charoda, GRP Charoda, PS Bhilai-III, Durg (CG)

VERSUS

Respondents/ Applicant	1. Rekha Kumari, 23 Yrs. w/o Satish Kumar 2. Nikhil, 3 Yrs. 3. Sahil, 8 Months *R/2-3 By Guardian Mother R/1* *2&3 are alleged to be S/o Petitioner which is denied in pleadings before court below* *All R/o* Tata Line, Qtr. No. 69, Camp No.-1, PS Chawni, Bhilai, Teh. & Distt Durg

P.R. No. 770616
Presented by Shri Rajesh Sharma
dated 21/12/06

PETITION U/ART. 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION

XI-HC-78

(19)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P 7553 **सन् 2006**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

16.1.2007

Shri Raja Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner.

By this petition, the petitioner has challenged the order dated 6.9.2006 passed by II Principal Judge, Family Court, Durg in M.J.C.No. 156/2006 whereby the learned Family Court allowing the application of the respondents for interim maintenance has awarded a sum of Rs. 1,800/- to the respondents – wife and minor children.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner has disputed the paternity of respondents No. 2 and 3 even then the Court below has passed the impugned order considering that the above fact is not disputed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

This petition is directed against the order of interim maintenance passed by the learned Family Court under the exercise of its jurisdiction. This Court after going through the

XI-HC-78

(20)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P. 7553 **सन् 200** 6

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	impugned order is of the considered opinion that there is no jurisdictional error committed by the Court below in passing the impugned order which calls for interference by this Court under Article 227 of Constitution of India. However, considering the grievance of the petitioner, it would be appropriate for the Court below to decide the matter on merits as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. With the aforesaid observation, the instant petition stands disposed of. **Sd/-** **Dhirendra Mishra** **Judge**	

P.T.O.

19/01/07